

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Criminal No. 11-10212-JLT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

JOHN WILLIS, et al.

ORDER ON EXCLUDABLE TIME

October 31, 2011

Boal, M.J.

Upon consideration of the government's assented-to motion seeking an order of excludable delay, the Court finds as follows:

1. A continuance of this proceeding from October 25, 2011, the date of the initial status conference, through and including April 25, 2012, which is the date of the last scheduled interim status conference, is necessary to ensure that counsel for the defendants and the defendants have sufficient time to review discovery and to investigate the evidence. I find, given the specific circumstances in this case, including the number of defendants and the volume of discovery, that this continuance constitutes "the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence." 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).

2. The ends of justice served by granting the continuance from October 25, 2011, through and including April 25, 2012, outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendants for a trial within seventy days of the date of the filing and making public of the indictment pursuant to the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(7)(A) and 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).

Accordingly, the Court hereby grants the government's motion and ORDERS that the period from October 25, 2011, through and including April 25, 2012, be excluded from the

Speedy Trial Act computation of the time within which trial in the case must begin, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(7)(A) and 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).¹

/s/ Jennifer C. Boal
JENNIFER C. BOAL
United States Magistrate Judge

¹ The parties are hereby advised that under the provisions of Rule 2(b) of the Rules for United States Magistrates in the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts, any party may move for reconsideration by a district judge of the determination(s) and order(s) set forth herein within fourteen (14) days after receipt of a copy of this order, unless a different time is prescribed by this court or the district judge. The party seeking reconsideration shall file with the Clerk of this Court, and serve upon all parties, a written notice of the motion which shall specifically designate the order or part thereof to be reconsidered and the basis for the objection thereto. The district judge, upon timely motion, shall reconsider the magistrate judge's order and set aside any portion thereof found to be clearly erroneous in fact or contrary to law. The parties are further advised that the United States Court of Appeals for this Circuit has indicated that failure to comply with this rule shall preclude further appellate review. See Phinney v. Wentworth Douglas Hospital, 199 F.3d 1 (1st Cir. 1999); Sunview Condo. Ass'n v. Flexel Int'l Ltd., 116 F.3d 962 (1st Cir. 1997); Pagano v. Frank, 983 F.2d 343 (1st Cir.1993).